

# Illinois Department of Transportation

## Memorandum

To:

J. C. Slifer

Attn: K. Hemstreet

From:

M. J. Macchio

By: Peter J. Frantz

Subject: Hazardous Waste Review\*

Date:

April 15, 1991

\*FAP 340 (431) ADDENDUM #1

Job No. P91-315-86 Lake-Will Freeway From I-55 to I-80

Cook, Will, and DuPage Counties

Attached is a copy of the Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment conducted by the Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) for the subject project as described in your Hazardous Waste Survey Request.

If volatile organic testing was done for this project and the attached (ISGS) report indicates no detection of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST's), then further soil boring and sample analysis work for underground tanks is not required.

It is the opinion of this office that the attached (ISGS) report's conclusion of no or low risk meets the requirements of Departmental Hazardous Waste Policy LEN-13, and no additional preliminary testing for this project is necessary.

However, the findings and recommendations of the report should be carefully considered.

Attachment

CLP/2919



Illinois Department of Transportation

### Memorandum

BUREAU OF PROGRAMMING RECEIVED

SEP 04 1991

To:

J. C. Slifer

Attn:

K. Henstreet CT #1

From:

M. J. Macchio

By: Peter J. Frantz

Subject:

Hazardous Waste Review\*

Date:

August 28, 1991

Geter J Ceans

\*FA 431
Section No. 99-2
Job No. R91-011-69
Archer Avenue (IL 171)
Will County

Attached is a copy of the Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment conducted by the Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) for the subject project as described in your Hazardous Waste Survey Request.

If volatile organic testing was done for this project and the attached (ISGS) report indicates no detection of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST's), then further soil boring and sample analysis work for underground tanks is not required.

It is the opinion of this office that the attached (ISGS) report's conclusion of no or low risk meets the requirements of Departmental Hazardous Waste Policy LEN-13, and no additional preliminary testing for this project is necessary.

However, the findings and recommendations of the report should be carefully considered.

Attachment

CLP/02951

To:

J. C. Slifer

Attn: A. L. Osnacz

From:

M. J. Macchio

By: Peter J. Frantz

Subject Hazardous Waste Review\*

Date: October 10, 1990

Attached is a copy of the Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment conducted by the Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) for the subject project as described in your Hazardous Waste Survey Request.

If volatile organic testing was done for this project and the attached (ISGS) report indicates no detection of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST's), then further soil boring and sample analysis work for underground tanks is not required.

It is the opinion of this office that the attached (ISGS) report's conclusion of no or low risk meets the requirements of Departmental Hazardous Waste Policy LEN-13, and no additional preliminary testing for this project is necessary.

However, the findings and recommendations of the report should be carefully considered.

Attachment

CLP

### COMMENT LETTERS AND LISTS OF COMMENTING PARTIES

### Federal, State, and Local Governmental Bodies and Interested Groups

- 1) Center for Neighborhood Technology February 28, 2001
- 2) Openlands Project February 28, 2001
- 3) City of Joliet, Department of Public Works and Utilities January 16, 2001
- 4) DuPage County Department of Development and Environmental Concerns February 28, 2001
- 5) DuPage County Regional Planning Agency March 29, 2001
- 6) Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (FPDDC) February 28, 2001
- 7) Forest Preserve District of Will County (FPDWC) February 22, 2001
- 8) Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Department of Water Resources (IDNR, DWR) January 11, 2001
- 9) Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) March 12, 2001
- 10) Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDOA) January 16, 2001
- 11) Illinois Environmental Council February 28, 2001
- 12) Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) February 28, 2001
- 13) Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS) January 17, 2001
- 14) Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) February 28, 2001
- 15) New Lenox School District 122 February 13, 2001
- 16) Lincoln-Way South Corridor Against the Tollway (LSCAT) February 26, 2001
- 17) Sierra Club February 28, 2001
- 18) United States Department of Commerce (USDOC) January 10, 2001
- 19) United States Department of the Interior (USDOI) January 10, 2001
- 20) United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region V (USEPA) February 26, 2001
- 21) Village of Lemont, Illinois February 28, 2001
- 22) Will County Land Use Department, Planning Division February 22, 2001
- 23) Village of Long Grove, Illinois February 27, 2001
- 24) Village of Woodridge, Illinois February 26, 2001
- 25) Will County Land Use Department February 28, 2001
- 26) Environmental Law and Policy Center (ELPC)/Business and Professional People for the Public Interest (BPI) –February 28, 2001 April 30, 2001

# **List of Commenting Parties with Comment/Response References**

	Name	Comment/Response Reference
1	Center for Neighborhood Technology	3.6, 4.27, 6.2
2	Openlands Project	3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 4.7, 4.12, 4.13, 4.15, 4.16, 4.18, 4.19, 4.25, 4.40, 4.41, 4.43, 7.1
3	City of Joliet, Dept of Public Works and Utilities	3.1, 3.2
4	DuPage County Department of Development and Environmental Concerns	4.5
5	DuPage County Regional Planning Agency	4.5
6	Forest Preserve District of DuPage County	2.3, 4.10, 4.22, 4.45, 4.46
7	Forest Preserve District of Will County	2.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.8, 4.9, 4.24, 4.26, 4.31, 4.37, 4.38, 4.39, 7.1
8	IDNR, Department of Water Resources	NONE
9	Illinois Department of Natural Resources	NONE
10	Illinois Department of Agriculture	NONE
11	Illinois Environmental Council	3.6, 3.7, 3.8
12	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	2.1
13	Illinois State Water Survey	NONE
14	Northeastern IL Planning Commission	4.5, 4.6, 4.23, 4.46, 6.1
15	New Lenox School District 122	4.2
16	Lincolnway South Corridor Against the Tollway	3.4, 3.8, 4.1, 4.3, 4.12, 4.20, 4.43
17	Sierra Club	3.3, 3.6, 3.8
18	United States Department of Commerce	NONE
19	United State Department of Interior	3.7, 4.11
20	United States Environmental Protection Agency	3.7, 4.11
21	Village of Lemont	1.1,4.29
22	Will County Land Use Department, Planning Division	NONE
23	Village of Long Grove	3.3, 3.6, 4.27, 6.2. 6.3, 7.1
24	Village of Woodridge	4.30
25	Will County Land Use Department	4.32, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35, 4.36, 6.1

Table 6-1 List of Federal, State and Local Governmental Bodies and Interested Groups with Comment/Response References		
	Name	Comment/Response Reference
26	Environmental Law and Policy Center/Business and Professional People for the Public Interest	1.2. 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, 3.26, 3.27, 3.28, 3.29, 3.30, 3.31, 3.32, 4.4, 4.14, 4.17, 4.21, 4.28, 4.42, 4.44, 4.47, 5.1, 5.2, 6.2, 6.3

Table 6-2 List of Public Commenting Parties with Comment/Response References		
	Name	Comment/Response Reference
1	Peter Arendovich	3.12, 4.1, 4.3
2	Edward Arends	4.22
3	Lois Arms	3.6, 3.8, 3.10
4	Jim Athans	3.20
5	Robert Baker	1.1, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6
6	Paula Bernadin	3.10, 4.6, 4.12, 4.14, 4.15, 4.20
7	Barbara Bialek	4.3, 4.6, 4.9, 4.14, 4.16
8	Dorothy Bialek	6.1, 6.2
9	Harry Cook	4.29
10	Larry Cook	4.7, 4.9, 4.16
11	Thomas Coughlin	3.7, 4.1, 4.3
12	T. Covehlin	3.8, 4.3
13	Thomas F. Cusack (Superintendent of School District 113A)	3.12, 4.22, 4.29
14	Lewis Cytlewski	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1
15	Jim Davis	4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 6.3
16	Kurt Derlir	4.12
17	John DeRoche	4.2, 4.22
18	Mr. & Mrs. Robert Diemer	4.4
19	Tom Drake	4.22, 4.27
20	Irwin Eaton	3.8
21	Richard S. Edler	3.12
22	Charles Englund	3.12, 4.3
23	Robert Erickson	3.4, 3.5

	Table 6-2 List of Public Commenting Parties with Comment/Response References		
	Name	Comment/Response Reference	
24	Marilyn Falcone	4.1, 4.3	
25	Ray Falcone	3.8, 4.3	
26	Rudy Fernandez	4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.9,	
27	Gregory Fisch	4.3	
28	Virginia Ferrell	5.1	
29	Vern Fisher	3.1	
30	James Flanagan	3.12, 4.10, 4.16, 4.28	
31	Mary Georghegan	3.8, 3.10, 3.12	
32	Mrs. John Grimm	3.7	
33	John Hamilton	2.1, 3.7, 7.1	
34	Kimberly Hartman	1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6	
35	Kurt Heslie	6.1	
36	Gene Hickmott	3.3, 4.5, 4.29	
37	Mr. & Mrs. Roy Hoffman	4.4	
38	James Holtrop	4.4	
39	(Homer Township Board of Trustees)	6.3	
40	John Horn	4.3	
41	Joanne Hunter	3.7, 3.8, 4.1	
42	Denise L. Jachineli	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
43	Ron Jerontowski	3.12, 4.1, 4.22	
44	Joan Johnson	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
45	Joyce Korista	3.8, 3.9, 4.11, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15	
46	Justine Lains	3.8, 7.1	
47	John Lamb	3.8, 7.1	
48	William Lawden	3.1	
49	Dave Leach	3.12	
50	Erwin Lopfstein	3.8, 4.3	
51	Tom Ludwig	3.2	
52	Sharron MacFarlane	3.9, 4.12, 4.18	
53	Donna Malanca	4.1, 4.13	
54	Gregory J. Malanca	3.8, 3.9, 4.12, 4.23	
55	James Marshall	4.18	

	Table 6-2 List of Public Commenting Parties with Comment/Response References		
	Name	Comment/Response Reference	
56	Daniel McCarron	3.7, 6.1	
57	Thomas Misek	3.7, 3.8, 7.1	
58	Curlis Mizener	4.19	
59	Andrew Muthart	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
60	Jonathan Ness	1.1, 4.3	
61	James E. Noonan	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
62	Sharon H. Noonan	3.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.11	
63	Elyse O'Churton	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
64	Mr. & Mrs. Andrew Onderisn	4.4	
65	Sue Orchard	1.2, 3.4, 4.1	
66	Margaret O'Shea	3.8, 4.4, 4.12	
67	Debbie Pawluk	3.8, 4.3, 4.13	
68	Joan Piwnicki	1.2, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.24	
69	Larry & Joan Piwnicki	4.22	
70	Jerry & Kathy Przbyca	3.18, 4.8	
71	Joan Pytlewski	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
72	Mary Raila	4.22	
73	Daniel J. Reardon	3.7, 3.8, 3.11	
74	Melony Rios	4.1, 4.6	
75	Brad Salamon	4.1, 4.6, 7.1	
76	Mr. & Mrs. Anthony Sartori	4.4	
77	Mary Scholp	1.2, 3.7, 4.1, 4.3, 7.1, 7.2	
78	Dan Schuda	3.12, 4.2	
79	Kenneth Shoenhofen	1.1, 1.2, 4.1, 4.6	
80	Deborah J. Smith	4.4, 4.25, 7.3	
81	Alan Snep	3.17, 4.1, 4.20, 4.22	
82	Gail Snyder	4.7	
83	Kenneth Spurhler	3.7, 7.1	
84	Anthony J. Standish	3.9	
85	Frank Studer	3.19	
86	Willaim Stull	4.14, 4.22	
87	Susan Theus	4.1, 4.22, 4.26	

	Table 6-2 List of Public Commenting Parties with Comment/Response References		
	Name	Comment/Response Reference	
88	Charles H. Thornton	3.7, 4.1, 4.11, 7.1	
89	Lionel Trepanier	4.12, 4.20, 6.1	
90	Frank L. Valentino	3.12	
91	Carolyn R. VanDyke	4.22	
92	Richard VanDyke	4.21, 4.22, 4.24	
93	Phil Vicena	3.17	
94	Sandee Vicena	3.17	
95	Wes Wagar	6.1	
96	Sherry Wold	3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17	
97	Rev. Louis Wold (First Assembly of God Church)	3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17	
98	Ben Entwistle	3.11, 3.13, 3.21, 3.22, 4.6, 7.4	

Aside from the 28 agencies and 98 individuals whose comments are referenced above, a large amount of additional comments, petitions, form letters and surveys were submitted as well. In total, over 19,500 comments, petitions and survey cards were submitted; approximately 78% were in support of the I-355 south extension, with the remaining 22% opposed. Details pertaining to the specifics are listed below.

#### **Record of Comments Received**

In total 2,336 comments were received during the Draft SEIS review period extending from the release of the Draft SEIS (December 29, 2000) until April 30, 2001. Of the 2,336 comments received, 1, 654 (71%) supported the project, 594 (25%) opposed the project and 88 (4%) had no position. Extracting the comments that did not state a position on the project, 74% of the people commenting favored constructing the I-355 south extension.

#### **Record of Individual Letters**

Of the 2, 336 comments received, approximately 1,400 were individual letters sent by citizens and organizations prior to June 2001. 169 individual letters were submitted on personal letterhead in support of the project, compared with 20 opposed. Additionally, 792 form letters were submitted in support of the project, compared with 386 opposed.

#### **Record of Petitions Received**

Since the initiation of the Supplemental EIS, almost 14,000 petition signatures have been received. Petitions were constructed to either favor or oppose the I-355 south extension. The Southern Alliance for the Extension (SAFE) coordinated a support petition that generated 10,556 signatures in support of the I-355 extension. Additionally, the Village of Orland Park coordinated a support petition that totaled 474 signatures. The Lincoln-Way South Corridor Against the Tollway (LSCAT) coordinated an oppose petition that generated 3,174 signatures

FAP 340 (I-355 SOUTH EXTENSION)

that opposed the I-355 south extension. In summation, 11,030 (78%) signatures were received in support of the I-355 south extension compared with 3,174 (22%) signatures that were opposed.

### **Record of Surveys Received**

A private business entity in the Village of New Lenox, located within the southern portion of the Project Corridor, distributed a survey to every address within the Village limits (9,521). The survey attained greater than a 36% (3,446) response rate. Of the 3,446 surveys returned, 2, 940 (85%), support the I-355 south extension, compare with 492 (14%) that were opposed and 14 (1%) that had no opinion.